



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## MONGOLIAN IMMIGRATION.

---

It would be impossible to treat this question fully within the necessarily restricted limits of a REVIEW article. The salient considerations involved may be stated and very briefly examined. This is what I propose to do in this paper.

I shall set forth :

*First.* The objections which have been urged against the Chinese as immigrants.

*Second.* The measures needed to meet all just objections to their immigration.

*Third.* The measures proposed in the recent treaty with China, and in legislation under that treaty, and the objections which may be urged against these measures, having regard to our domestic policy and interests, also to our commercial policy and interests.

I. It is said that the Chinese in this country are not freemen, and that it is not just to our people to force upon them competition with a servile class.

It is clear that we should not tolerate a servile class among us. I contend, however, that Chinese labor, as it is seen in this country, is not servile.

It is an admitted fact that no slave-holding, rightly so called, is known in China. It is an admitted fact that no Chinaman in this country has appealed to the courts to be freed from a condition of slavery. Under these circumstances, those who allege that Chinese labor is servile have fallen back upon the proposition that the Chinese come to us under a contract system, which is a modified form of slavery.

But of this there is no proof. If contracts are made, under which the lenders of money control laborers, there should be no difficulty in demonstrating the fact. In all the history of the anti-Chinese agitation, not one such contract has been produced,

saving only in the case of prostitutes, and no evidence has been given as of knowledge proving the fact.

I do not speak of the Chinese in Peru or in Cuba, but of those in this country. In Peru and Cuba, contracts to labor may be enforced; they cannot be enforced in the United States. Many Chinese have been decoyed into contracts to labor in those countries, but the fact that the contract system cannot be sustained at law among us offers a sufficient explanation of the other fact that it does not prevail among those who come to our shores.

I do not assert that Chinese who are proposing to come to this country do not borrow money in China and agree to repay it out of their earnings here. This practice prevails among immigrants from all countries, but it does not create nor imply servile labor. It shows simply that a given person has the capacity to contract as a freeman, and that the lender expects his client to behave as an honest freeman should.

As a matter of fact, evidence taken in California proves that the Chinese in this country are controlled by no masters. They take service when, where, and with whom they please. They leave service when it suits them to do so. They are almost as exacting in these respects as are the other laborers of the country.

It is said again that they displace white laborers.

The laboring man in the communities of the Pacific coast sees Chinamen at work all around him. He sees also, sometimes, if not often, white men who are not at work. It is natural for him to believe, under these circumstances, that the Chinese are getting the wages which white men would command if the Chinese were absent. He has found wages tending to fall, and it is natural for him to judge that this tendency results from the competition of Asiatics. This simple way of looking at the matter may be very incorrect, nevertheless.

It is well known that wages are higher in California than elsewhere in America, and herein lies the proof that there has been no ruinous competition between the two races. An over-supply of labor causes low wages; an inadequate supply may cause high wages. The laboring man may argue the case in whatever way and with whatever sincerity, but the facts decide the question.

There are some directions in which Chinese labor controls the market in California, but Chinamen have not displaced white men even in these directions. They make cigars. None to speak of were made in California until the Chinese took up the trade.

They make shoes. None were made before they began the business. They wash clothes. As a rule, it is the clothing of white mechanics and laborers and of their families. They do a great deal of the work of railroad-building and of reclaiming swamp lands. The supply of white laborers has been inadequate in both directions.

It should be remembered, also, that the Chinese have made possible industries which could not have been undertaken in their absence, and which have given larger opportunities to our own people. We occupy the territory made available by the railroads which have been constructed with the assistance of Chinamen. We till the swamp lands reclaimed by them. We own the mills and larger factories in which they work, and the sum of the wages of our people who are employed is far away in excess of those of the Chinese operatives.

That wages should tend to fall in California was to be expected. They were far higher than elsewhere in our country, and still are. The influx of population must necessarily work a change in this respect. But the white man of California is raised in the scale of industry by the presence of the Chinese, and he gets a larger wage to-day, probably, than he would if the Chinese were not present. At the same time the labors of the Chinese reduce the cost for him of all the necessities of life.

It is urged, further, that Chinamen send their wages out of the country.

The Chinaman wears good clothing and eats good food when he can afford to do so. He is not so far a slave to the habits of his ancestors as to wear a suit of cotton cloth and sandals of straw when he can do better, nor eat rice when a fuller diet is available. The conditions of climate and of labor among us are so far different from those in South China, that better clothes and better food become indispensable. As a matter of fact, the Chinese in California dress better than other laborers, and eat quite as good food.

It follows that the Chinese, like most other people, live well up to their incomes. I do not believe that they are able to send out of the country more than ten per cent. of their wages. The advantage of the other ninety per centum remains with us. They create much wealth and carry away a small portion of it only.

It is declared again that the Chinese are vicious.

A great deal of confusion must exist in the minds of the people of the Eastern States in consequence of the contradictory

reports which come from California in regard to the Chinese. How, for instance, are we to reconcile the statement that they are industrious and frugal with the allegation that they are vicious? People who are vicious are usually indolent and reckless; careless of themselves as they are careless of others. The industrious and frugal man is the reverse. Yet we hear the one statement as often as the other. It is because many believe that the Chinese are industrious and frugal in a remarkable degree, that they say their competition is to be dreaded.

The truth lies between the extremes of opinion. There is industry and frugality among the Chinese; there is vice and destitution. They are not unlike the people of California in these respects, and not unlike the most favored of mankind.

The statistics of the charitable and penal institutions of California bear out this statement. The Chinese scarcely enter our hospitals. They are not encouraged to do so, perhaps, and they have the not undesirable habit of caring for their own sick. Regard being had to their numbers and the disparity between the sexes, they do not exceed the whites in the prisons of the State. There would be fewer of them in prison if they were dealt with more liberally and justly.

As a commentary upon the lack of care shown by the State in dealing with the Chinese, it should be known that there is not to-day one competent interpreter of Chinese in the permanent employment of the State, or of any town, city, or county in the State. No pains are taken to learn how far they may be trusted and none to secure their trust—to win them away from crime or to deal intelligently with crime when it occurs.

A further and very positive declaration is that the Chinese will not assimilate with our people; that they do not care to become citizens; that they are not fit to become citizens; that our civilization makes no impress upon them; that they remain, and will remain forever, an alien and indigested element in our body politic.

Perhaps no misstatement which has been put in circulation in regard to the much-abused Chinaman has been more often repeated or has found more ready acceptance than this; yet it is as unfounded as it would be to declare that one earth does not nourish him and us; one heaven does not overarch his race and ours. The Chinaman does assimilate with us when we allow him to do so.

I have not intended to cite evidence in this paper, but there is one bit of testimony before me which is so touching and so true that I quote it here, as it was read lately in the Senate of the United States. The writer is a lady resident in Connecticut. She says :

"It is seventeen years to-day since my brother, a young man of rare promise, laid down his life on a Southern battle-field in defense of human rights, and his blood cries out against those who are trying to make us believe that God and our fathers meant only black and white when they declared the nations of one blood.

"Ten years ago we received into our household two Chinese lads, twelve years of age, who came from the middle or merchant class, and were members of the Chinese educational mission recently recalled. These boys, taken from heathen surroundings, were not only as intelligent, courteous, and refined as any youths in this Christian land, but they were exceptionally noble and high-minded. During all these years they have grown into the heart of our family life, tender of our sick and aged, sorrowing with us over our dead, until they have become our own kindred ; and the hopes and ambitions buried in our brother's grave blossom anew as they live over his experiences in their college career. You can understand, then, how our hearts grow hot with indignation as we hear men who are not worthy to stand in their presence speak of our beloved brethren as belonging to an essentially and irreclaimably inferior race. Like the Jews of old who despised the Gentiles, these noble Senators will, some of them, see the despised Chinaman sitting with Abraham and Isaac, and themselves, the children of the kingdom, cast out."

Nearly twenty years of my life were spent in China. I cannot recollect the moment during all those years when among the officials of the country, and among those people who had been educated more or less by contact with Western people, I had not friends with whom intercourse was a matter of satisfaction and pleasure. For general kindliness, the Chinese official is not inferior to any other class of officials. For earnestness of purpose and aspiration, the Chinaman who has become a proselyte to our religion, or has observed the progressive tendencies of our civilization, leaves nothing to be desired. If they possessed less stability of character, were fickle and variable, if they would put on our garments, and conform to our own habits in mere externals, they would appear to the average observer in a more hopeful way ; but this would not make them more worthy of esteem and confidence.

If they do not assimilate, in what do they not ? It is admitted that they take up with our industries. It is admitted that they are keen merchants and traders. It is admitted that they learn

our language quickly. It is admitted that many join our churches. Their dress in our country is a mixture of their own and ours, they live in our kind of houses, they eat our food, they follow us, in fact, about as fast and as far as we allow them to follow.

I have no patience with the statement that the Chinaman is a different sort of being from ourselves. I do not agree with Senator Miller when he says that one person like Washington or Newton, Franklin or Lincoln, has been of more service to humanity than all the Chinese who have lived and died in the lands of the Hoang-ho. Sir Frederick Bruce knew them, and said that the members of the cabinet of Peking were fit to be compared with those of any Western cabinet. What was the secret of the enthusiasm of Anson Burlingame? Why has Yung Wing been sought in all American society where he has been known? Why does the study of the literature of China fascinate all who enter upon it? Why has China had a settled government far longer than any other race or people?

There is merit in the Chinese stock, and those who do not see the fact do not know them or are blinded by prejudice. Having merit, they would become a valuable accession to our society if we would allow them. They were far away ahead of us in the arts and sciences, and in the refinements of life, a few generations ago. We must not claim that our stock is a better one now, unless we are prepared to admit that theirs was a better one then.

A further objection urged against the Chinese as immigrants is that they are likely to overwhelm us; that their numbers and necessities are great, and that they will fall upon our shores in such force as to take possession of all our employments, and leave us no room and breathing space.

I should not like to see such a condition of things, but I am aware of no reason why it may be expected. If the history of their race gave one instance in which they have occupied the territory of men of Caucasian origin, I might feel differently. So far are they from having done this that they have left intact the boundaries even of their Asiatic neighbors. They do not come among us in considerable numbers. In thirty years they have given to the Pacific coast less than one hundred thousand people, while we of the Eastern States and of Europe have poured in there at least one million. They do not hold their

ratio in the population, but are becoming less numerous in relation to the whole.

It will be time enough to deal with this danger when it arrives. To-day it is not a danger at all. An Eastern man may smile at the fears of Californians when he sees eight hundred thousand Europeans arriving in New York as against ten or a dozen thousand Chinese at San Francisco; a million, perhaps, to reënforce fifty millions against ten thousand to reënforce one hundred thousand.

Other objections have been urged against the Chinese, some of which are unfounded and others are more or less just. Among the former are such statements as that they have set up a government of their own upon our soil, that they would not fight for us in time of war, etc. Among the latter are the declarations that the few Chinese women in this country are in large part prostitutes, that many criminals find immunity by escaping to our shores, and that some diseased persons and paupers come among us. I shall not stop to disprove the first of these allegations, nor do more here than to say that while there are evils in the latter directions, the tendency in California has been to draw a darker picture than the facts warrant.

II. Three years ago, while Minister at Peking, I undertook to effect an arrangement with the Chinese Government which would afford to the Chinese the continued protection of the Burlingame treaty, and at the same time meet in a reasonable way such objections to their immigration as might be entertained honestly by our own people. The Chinese Government received my representations in a liberal spirit, and agreed to execute further articles with us under which the migration of their people to our shores should remain unquestioned, saving in those directions in which we were prepared to urge that evils might have occurred. The pauper, the lewd woman, the criminal, the diseased person, the person who had sold his labor, we could complain of as unsatisfactory immigrants. Against the Chinese as Chinese I had no objections to offer, although I pointed out that more radical measures might be demanded by our Government under the pressure of public opinion.

Against the measures thus proposed no sound objections can be urged. They were conformed to the spirit of our institutions and to our traditional policy. They were conformed also to the



practice among civilized people at large, and to the canons of that unwritten law which is recognized by each civilized people in its intercourse with other peoples. They were not offensive to China. They were well calculated to draw more close the friendship between us which had been fostered and strengthened by years of honest intercourse.

I may be allowed to present this proposed disposition of the matter as in all respects sufficient and satisfactory. For if the Chinaman who comes to our shores is not a criminal nor a pauper, is not diseased and does not bear the taint of a servile condition, in what respect is he objectionable?

This settlement was rejected. Its details even have not been given to the public. Called for twice by resolutions of the House and Senate, the correspondence remains in the files of the State Department, held back, as if the public cannot be trusted to know all about it. Instead of this settlement another has been proposed and partially accepted, which is open to the gravest objections.

III. Those who hold that Chinese labor is servile, that the Chinese displace laborers of our own stock, that they send their earnings out of the country, that they are vicious, that they will not assimilate with us, that they are destined to overrun our country, having asserted all these things, take it for granted that all men must agree in their conclusion that the Chinese should be excluded from among us.

That the statements of fact put forward by these persons are largely unfounded is shown, as I believe, in the evidence and considerations which have been briefly summarized in the first portion of this paper. The methods adopted by them to force their conclusion upon the country should be noted here.

Two years ago the Burlingame treaty was in force. It was as binding upon us as any other treaty in the whole list of treaties to which the nation was pledged. By its stipulations the right was guaranteed to the Chinese to come among us and to dwell with us; yet the anti-Chinese politicians of the Pacific coast demanded of Congress and secured the passage of a bill, which provided that no more than fifteen Chinese passengers should be allowed to come within our borders by any one vessel.

The President refused to approve this bill, reminding Con-

gress and the country of the fact that the good faith and honor of the nation made his veto necessary.

In that instance the people opposed to the Chinese gravely discredited themselves. At this moment they are doing the same thing. For although they have been able to secure a treaty with China, made in their own interest, they are not content to keep within its lines in their eagerness to accomplish the purpose which they have set before them.

By the recent treaty with China we secured the right "to regulate, limit, or suspend" the immigration of Chinese laborers. The treaty provides, however, that the principle involved in the Burlingame treaty shall not be discredited by the new stipulations, that immigration shall not be prohibited, and that any limitation or suspension proposed by us shall be reasonable.

The intent of the Chinese Government in the matter may be inferred with a degree of certainty from the text of the treaty as indicated above. It becomes clear beyond dispute, in view of the following extract from the *précis* of a conversation between their commissioners and our own, given to our Government by the latter, as having taken place on the 23d of October, 1880, while the negotiations were in progress. The Chinese are put upon the record as follows :

"By limitation in number they meant, for example, that the United States having, as they supposed, a record of the number of immigrants in each year, as well as the number of Chinese now there, no more should be allowed to go in any one year in future than either the greatest number which had gone in any year in the past, or the least number which had gone in any year in the past, or that the total number should never be allowed to exceed the number now there. As to limitation in time, they meant, for example, that Chinese should be allowed to go in alternate years, or every third year, or that they should not be allowed to go for two, three, or five years."

Alongside of this declaration of the views of the Chinese commissioners may be placed the following statement by our commissioners of the action which our Government would probably take if accorded the right to legislate in the premises. It is taken from the same document :

"If Chinese immigration concentrated in cities, where it threatened public order, or if it confined itself to localities where it was an injury to the interests of the American people, the Government of the United States would undoubtedly take steps to prevent such accumulations of Chinese. If, on the contrary,

there was no large immigration, or if there were sections of the country where such immigration was clearly beneficial, then the legislation of the United States under this power would be adapted to such circumstances. There might be a demand for Chinese labor in the South and a surplus of such labor in California, and Congress might legislate in accordance with these facts."

Now, what is the legislation which has been proposed under the treaty so made? It is not to regulate the number of immigrants, so that they shall not exceed the greatest or the least number of the immigration of years gone by, not to suspend immigration for two or three or five years, not to prohibit immigration at one point and to admit it elsewhere, but to absolutely prohibit the coming of all industrial Chinese for twenty years.

Well might a Senator of Southern birth and allegiance demand, in view of such proposed legislation: "Can we believe that the Chinese Government would have agreed to the treaty if they had understood that this was to be our interpretation of it?"

Again: The treaty provides that—

"Chinese subjects, whether proceeding to the United States as teachers, students, merchants, or from curiosity, together with their body and household servants, and Chinese laborers who are now in the United States, shall be allowed to go and come of their own free will and accord, and shall be accorded all the rights, privileges, immunities, and exemptions which are accorded to the citizens and subjects of the most favored nations."

The opponents of the Chinese, having initiated legislation intended to exclude Chinese laborers, found it necessary to propose further that persons not laborers coming from China shall provide themselves with passports, and to provide for a cumbersome and vexatious registration system. The first step, so unusual as between nations at peace, must be followed by these further steps or it would prove futile. And so the burden of proof was to be shifted from ourselves upon the Chinese at whatever cost to the latter, and regardless of the treaty which prohibits us from making such rules unless we make them for all the rest of the world.

This act, so subversive of the treaty, was returned to Congress by the President, disapproved "for the honor of the country." It has been followed by another act which has already passed the House, and which is said to contain practically all of the objec-

tionable features of the first act, saving only the reduction of the term of prohibition from twenty years to ten, a reduction which does not bring the law within the treaty by any means.

There are two general features of the bills in question which should be spoken of here.

First, as to the exclusion of any people from our shores.

There can be no doubt that any nation has a right to exclude an individual immigrant for cause personal to himself. I doubt, however, whether there is to-day any nation that is called civilized which excludes immigrants because of race or for economical reasons. It certainly has not been our practice, saving in days when slavery controlled our legislation, and then only as respects the negro.

It is alleged, nevertheless, that a whole race or class may be shut out for reasons which would operate in the case of the individual, and in the recent treaty with China a show of defense for the new policy is put forward as follows: "If," the treaty says, "the coming of Chinese laborers to the United States, or their residence therein, affects or threatens to affect the interests of that country, or to endanger the good order of the country, or of any locality thereof," then the United States may regulate, limit, etc.

I insist that under this stipulation and in view of the practice to which we have adhered in common with civilized states generally, it is incumbent upon us to make out a clear case against the Chinese before we can exclude them at all. Those of the Chinese who have come among us heretofore have been very useful to us, and they have been peaceable. It is not dangerous to admit such a class, and their coming cannot affect our country or any part of it unfavorably. It is no answer to say that our people will abuse them, that we cannot protect them. It is our duty to protect all innocent men among us, and we fail in our duty if we do not. We have protected the Chinese measurably, and it is likely that we can do so now better than ever in the past.

Second, as to the exclusion of the Chinese from naturalization.

The act which passed the two houses of Congress and was vetoed by the President contained this section:

"16. That hereafter no State court or court of the United States shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."

It has been our practice to admit to citizenship all persons who declare their intention to remain among us, and who have been with us for a period fixed by law. This, also, is a practice which is more or less observed in all countries. It is more appropriate for us than for other countries, because our state is democratic, and because it is more difficult, perhaps, to defend a disfranchised class here than elsewhere in the world.

Now it should be understood, as I think, that many of the Chinese in this country are well qualified by education and intelligence to vote, and that it will be far easier to defend the whole class of the Chinese if the suffrage be granted to such of their numbers as are fit to use it. The argument is not different from that which was used regarding the negro after the civil war. To admit the negro to vote was objectionable for many reasons. It was necessary, however, in order to defend him against the wrongs to which the members of a disfranchised class might be subjected. If it should be granted that few Chinese are fit to vote, still the suffrage should be extended more or less freely to them. We have often to choose between evils. Three thousand such voters in California would make a great difference in the temper of the two political parties, and three thousand intelligent and educated Chinese may certainly be found within the State.

It has been urged, and with reason as I think, that refusal to naturalize Chinese would constitute a violation of the recent treaty with China. For although we do not grant citizenship in pursuance of treaty stipulations, we do in effect grant it to all comers, and to withhold it from the Chinese only is inconsistent with the "most favored nation" clause of that treaty.

The field of discussion thus opened is extensive and interesting. It is unsatisfactory to pass by it so hastily, but there are other considerations which must be suggested.

China has not yet ranged herself perfectly in line with Western states. She maintains reserve in her relations with the West, and adheres to institutions and methods which are singular. Yet her territory is vast, her resources great, her industries numerous, her population uncounted. She offers to our people a great field for enterprise. She lies facing us on the opposite shores of the Pacific, and for all reasons our intercourse with her should be extensive and profitable.

More fortunate than some other Asiatic states, China has

never been subjected to European conquest, and no terms have been imposed upon her by foreign powers, saving such as have been reasonably necessary to defend persons resorting to her shores for purposes of trade and to protect their property. The treaties with China are alike in their general terms, and the fact raises a strong presumption that the several powers have judged the situation alike, and found the same measures requisite for the safe conduct of intercourse.

The special features of the treaties to which attention should be called are as follows: *First*. They exempt foreigners from the jurisdiction of the territorial authorities and provide for courts of the various countries concerned. *Second*. They establish a permanent tariff of duties on all merchandise imported or exported. *Third*. They provide a system under which merchandise owned by foreigners may be carried free of duties throughout the interior.

The first treaties were made in 1842-44, and just as these treaties were singular yet identical, so it has happened that the powers have been drawn into a general concert of action to maintain these stipulations as well as might be and to secure good relations.

It will be said at once that such treaties must be distasteful to China. This is true, and it is true that China will struggle to free herself from them. They defend foreigners in their dealings with China. They defend Chinese in their dealings with foreigners. They have made trade and intercourse possible, to our advantage and the advantage of China. Yet they are burdensome and abnormal, and create difficulties which are only less serious than those which they are intended to remedy. No government will be just to China or to itself which does not lend aid to China—not to break away from the treaties, but to so far improve her policy and administration that such treaties will no longer be needed. China has already done something in this direction, but she is still far from having wrought out the conditions under which we may trust our people and their property to her control, as we trust them to the control of the more advanced states with which we are allied.

The policy of China has been based on the principle of non-intercourse. Our policy has been to break down this disposition on her part, and to bring her into relations for our own advantages and for hers. We have pleaded for broader intercourse in

good faith. We have justified strong measures intended to bring about a broader intercourse and better relations. We have asserted the inalienable right of our people to mingle with hers. We have built upon that corner-stone as she has builded upon the other.

And now what are we doing but abandoning our own ground and taking a place on hers? And what must be the result of this singular departure?

It has been said that the Chinese are utterly indifferent to the treatment accorded to their people in this country. I have never supposed that the Government of Peking cares particularly to defend the immigrant for his own sake or for the sake of the material interests of the Empire. But I have supposed that the highest officials of the Empire feel keenly the fact that we despise their people, and impose upon them restrictions which we do not place upon others. They are proud of their stock and of their country, as they have much right to be, and, like Shakespeare's Jew, they will resent unfriendliness.

Out of respect and friendliness for us, the Government of China was prepared to join us in instituting the measures needed to prevent the supposed vicious elements of the migrating stream from reaching our shores. We rejected this mode of dealing with the matter, and demanded permission to suspend all immigration. Two courses were open to China. She could have said, "No, we will not agree to such a discrimination against our people," or "Yes, go on, but be reasonable." She chose the latter course, and there was not a little shrewdness in her policy.

She has felt the pressure upon her which has resulted from the concert of action between the foreign powers. If she should hold us to our treaty obligations, we would continue the effort to hold her to hers. If she should release us, and we, taking the liberty given, should break away in fancied irresponsibility, what would be easier for her than to turn upon us and demand acquiescence when she seeks to break away from the bonds in which the treaties have bound her? It has required the united diplomatic pressure of all the nations to hold her up to her engagements. We have distinctly severed ourselves from the general concert, and the consequences may be disastrous. There may be no change evident to the ordinary observer, but having divided in a practical way the forces arrayed in defense of trade and intercourse, she may take up a reactionary policy with less danger than before.

It will be dangerous, nevertheless, for China to enter upon a more active reactionary policy. A fair observance of existing treaties is all that the West has insisted upon. With the Western powers united, China has yielded a more or less perfect obedience to the treaties. With the Western powers divided, she may be encouraged to overstep or disregard the treaties, and to this sort of thing there can be but one result: force will be brought to bear and the integrity of the Empire threatened.

The part of America in China has been to make no extreme demands. We have sought to be moderate ourselves and to moderate the counsels of other states, so that we might stand with them in all respects. Our friendliness has been appreciated by the Chinese, and they have turned to us in all their difficulties with confident reliance upon our good disposition. Our policy has been dictated by a sense of justice, and yet it has been far-seeing. It is an object for us to defend the Chinese people against all foreign encroachments, and to preserve the Empire for that long future of beneficial intercourse which we have had a right to expect.

The conditions created by the presence of their people in California have aided us in the successful prosecution of our policy. We have dealt liberally with them in despite of many difficulties. The Chinese Government has appreciated this, and the fact has armed us with the strongest possible claim upon its confidence and the strongest possible arguments for greater liberality on its part.

But to-day what strength has America in China? We have never been feared. We shall not be feared in the future. They know as well as we do that we will never call the gun-boat into action. Their gun-boats, in fact, are rather better than ours. Our strength has been in our moral position, and that we seem determined to abandon. To be neither feared nor loved by an Asiatic state is to be despised, and that is what we are coming to, apparently, in China.

We have a measure of strength, of course, from the fact that other powers will defend the rights of their people who are resident upon Chinese soil, and that our people will obtain the protection of foreign governments. The situation which is thus indicated should not gratify us. We make the difficulties of other powers greater by our dealings with the Chinese. Illiberal and dishonest courses on our part militate against all foreigners,



and to stand behind them under such circumstances will not tend to exalt us in our own esteem, in theirs, or in that of the Chinese.

It has been supposed that our commissioners advanced the influence of America in China, while striking a blow at England. I refer to the clause of the so-called commercial treaty negotiated by them, in which they agreed that our people in China shall not buy, sell, or transport opium. We grew very complacent over this, quite forgetting that the Chinese themselves grow opium, buy and sell it, transport it, and derive large revenues from it, and that they will continue to do so. There is no clause regarding opium in any treaty with China which was made under pressure. We ourselves suggested the terms upon which foreign opium is brought in, and we made the suggestion because it was desirable to regulate a traffic which neither side cared to condemn. We grew complacent over the action of our commissioners, but others concerned are wise enough to see that we effected by it only a certain grave discrimination against our merchants. Opium, so far as we are concerned, was a medium of exchange. It was a good cargo and a good remittance. It remains so for them, but not for us. If the Chinese were disposed to exclude opium from the Empire, the case would be different. They are not disposed to do so, and they have used our pretended humanitarianism to point the finger of scorn at England, and to put us measurably out of the range of competition in the carrying trade of their coast and rivers. That is what the opium clause accomplishes, and no more.

If I am right in my views, then we are tending to take up a policy as respects the Chinese which is at variance with all that has been best in our earlier intercourse with them; which is at variance with the principles which have been observed by us in our intercourse with the people of other states; which is at variance with the practices of civilized states generally, and which will militate against real interests on our own soil and the interests of our people engaged in commerce. We have yielded to the cry from the sand-lots, and all the rest has followed, as a matter of course. It remains to be seen whether there is good sense and principle enough in the country to bring us back at the last moment to a more honorable and a more discreet policy.

GEORGE F. SEWARD.